



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/700,263	11/03/2003	Darroll D. Bengtson	R11.12-0782	3685
27367	7590 09/13/2005	EXAMINER		
WESTMAN CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A. SUITE 1400 - INTERNATIONAL CENTRE 900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH			THOMPSON, JEWEL VERGIE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNEAPO	LIS, MN 55402-3319	2855		
			D. M. S. L. H. ED. 00/10/000	_

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/700,263	BENGTSON, DARROLL D.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Jewel V. Thompson	2855			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	•	orrespondence address			
Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. sely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	_:				
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☒ This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
,	· 				
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-9 and 20-22 is/are solution. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 10-19 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	withdrawn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on 03 November 2003 is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	re: a) \square accepted or b) \square object drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/3/03.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:				

Art Unit: 2855

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. Acknowledgement is made of the Information Disclosure Statement filed November 11, 2003, which has been made record of and placed in the file.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 13 does not have antecedent basis for the "flow conditioner". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanimura et al (5,052,229) in view of Khalifa (4,841,781)

Regarding claim 10, Tanimura et al a vortex flow meter for installation between pipe flanges of size N, comprising:

Application/Control Number: 10/700,263

Art Unit: 2855

A. a vortex sensor assembly shaped to fit a standard sensor interface on a unitary flowtube (fig. 1);

B. a unitary flowtube (1) having the standard sensor interface, and a bore of size number (N-A) where A is an integer in the range 1,2 and having diameter expanders (fig. 1) coupling between the flowtube flanges (1a) and the bore (fig. 1); and C. the unitary flow tube being formed as a unitary casting that is free of seams (fig. 1). Tanimura et al fails to teach having upstream and downstream flowtube flanges of size. Khalifa teaches a vortex flow meter having upstream flanges (1) and downstream flanges (1, fig. 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to have placed another flange in the downstream position as that of Khalifa in the flow meter of Tanimura et al for the purpose of being able to insert the flow meter in either side of the tubing.

Regarding claims 11 and 16, Tanimura et al teaches a flow conditioner (4) that comprises a plate perforated by multiple holes (fig. 8) that is part of the unitary casting (fig. 1).

Regarding claims 12 and 17, Tanimura et al teaches the plate has streamlined edges around the multiple holes (fig. 8).

Regarding claims 13 and 18, Tanimura et al fails to teach the flow conditioner comprises vanes having streamlined edges. Khalifa teaches a flow conditioner (figs. 3 and 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to have used the conditioner with vanes of Khalifa in the flow meter of Tanimura et al for the purpose of providing the required amount of turbulence which

Application/Control Number: 10/700,263

Art Unit: 2855

is necessary to stimulate the sunken stream effect without harming the process of vortex formation in the case of a vortex flow meter (Khalifa, col. 4, lines 25-29)

Regarding claim 15, Tanimura et al teaches a vortex flowmeter for installation between pipe flanges of size N, comprising:

A. a vortex sensor assembly shaped to fit a standard sensor interface on a unitary flowtube;

B. a unitary flowtube having the standard sensor interface, and a bore of a size number at least as small as (N-1), and having diameter expanders coupling between the flowtube flanges and the bore; and

C. a flow conditioner of size number N across an opening in the upstream flange (fig. 1). Tanimura et al fails to teach having upstream and downstream flow tube flanges of size N. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to have placed another flange in the downstream position as that of Khalifa in the flow meter of Tanimura et al for the purpose of being able to insert the flow meter in either side of the tubing.

4. Claims 14, 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanimura et al in view of Khalifa as applied to claims 10 and 15 above, and further in view of Kleven (6,658,945).

Regarding claims 14 and 19, Tanimura et al in view of Khalifa fails to teach a measured calibration with the diameter expanders, and flanges in place stored in the vortex flowmeter. Kleven teaches a microprocessor which calculates a calibration

Page 5

faction (col. 6, lines 31-32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to have used the microprocessor of Kleven in the flow meter of Tanimura et al for the purpose of factoring the changes of the vortex sensor assembly (Kleven, col. 6, lines 31-34).

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jewel V. Thompson whose telephone number is 571-272-2189. The examiner can normally be reached on 7-4:30, off alternate Mondays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Lefkowitz can be reached on 571-272-2180. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

September 9, 2005